

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed on June 16, 2004, the Examiner had rejected claims 1-2, and 8-10 as being anticipated by *Schumann* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,146,141), and had rejected claims 3, 11, and 12 as being obvious with respect to *Schumann* in view of *Yarborough, Jr.* (U.S. Pat. 4,380,437). Claims 15-17 were determined to be allowable, but renumbering was requested. In response, Applicants amended claims 1, 5, and 6 to overcome the obviousness rejections and claims 15-17 to correct the numbering of the claims to 14-16. Additionally, Applicants included new claims 17-22 that were substantially commensurate with the amended claims, and therefore Applicants asserted that the amended claims addressed the Examiner's arguments, and that the new claims were simply included in the spirit of the amended claims.

In the Examiner's response dated December 13, 2004, the Examiner requested that Applicants' reply further include arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims patentable over any applied references. Consequently, Applicants provide the following clarifications as to why Applicants believe that all of the claims are patentable over the applied references.

In particular, claims 1, 5, and 6 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner, with the description of the pilot valve included in claim 1. Applicant submits that neither *Schumann* nor *Yarborough, Jr.* describe the use of the pilot valve as claimed. Furthermore, Applicant submits that neither cited reference describes the recoil valve as described in claim 6 and used in the valve chamber as defined in claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 1, and those claims depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

Claims 17-22 have been added to further clarify the present invention in view of the Examiner's comments and the references cited by the Examiner. In particular, claim 17 has been added which defines a housing, a gas supply, a valve chamber, a recoil valve, and an electrically-controlled valve that is used to convey gas from the gas supply to the recoil valve. Claim 17, like claim 1, defines a valve that is connected between the gas supply and the recoil valve to allow transmission of gas into the recoil valve to displace the recoil valve in the valve chamber. Specifically, the electrically-controlled valve of claim 17 is connected between the gas supply and the recoil valve to allow transmission of gas into the recoil valve to displace the recoil valve in the valve chamber. None of the cited references teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, a simulated weapon device that simulates recoil using a regulated gas supply for moving a piston wherein an electrically-controlled valve conveys the gas to the recoil valve to displace the recoil valve in the valve chamber. Furthermore, Applicants submit that claims 18-20 depend from allowable claim 17, and therefore are in condition for allowance as well.

Similarly, Applicants submit that the cited references do not disclose the method of operation as defined in claims 21 and 22. In particular, Claims 21 and 22 define the use of pilot valve in a firearm shell that is used to convey gas from a gas supply through the pilot valve into a valve chamber housing a recoil valve. The recoil valve is shifted or displaced in the valve chamber according to the gas supplied, such that the piston is displaced in the piston chamber to generate recoil. As noted for amended claim 1 and new claim 17, neither *Schumann* nor *Yarborough, Jr.* teach or suggest a simulated firearm that imitates recoil using a regulated gas supply for moving the piston via gas that is distributed through the pilot valve to displace the

Application No. 10/631,944
Amend. dated January 13, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 13, 2004

recoil valve in the valve chamber. Thus, Applicants submit that new claim 21 is in condition for allowance, and that claim 22 inherits allowability from claim 21.

Applicants believe that the present response, in addition to the reply submitted by the Applicants on September 17, 2004, presents the necessary arguments pointing out the distinctions believed to render the present claims patentable over the cited references. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request favorable action at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By: 
Christopher A. Holland, Reg. No. 46,316

Suite 3100, Promenade II
1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3592
Telephone: (404) 815-3770
Facsimile: (404) 685-7070